

*Application No.: 10/662,356*  
*Art Unit: 2836*

*Attorney Docket No. 6935.15*  
*Confirmation No. 2061*

**IN THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 2A, 2B and 4. These sheets, which includes Figs. 2A, 2B and 4, replaces the original sheets including Figs. 2A, 2B and 4. In Figure 2A, previously omitted reference characters --18-- and --20-- have been added. In Figure 2B, previously omitted reference characters --14--, --16-- and --20-- have been added. In Figure 4, previously omitted reference character --20-- have been added.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets (3)  
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes (3)

**REMARKS**

By the present amendment, Applicant has amended the specification and Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 15. Claims 3, 12 and 18-20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-17 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9, 14 and 15 are independent claims. A check in the amount of \$100.00 is enclosed to cover the added independent claim.

In the recent Office Action the Examiner objected to the specification and drawings. Claims 1, 2, 9, 11 and 18 because of certain informalities. Claims 1-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-6 and 9-15 were rejected by the Examiner on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of your U.S. Patent No. 6,600,236 in view of Wong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,985). Claims 2-6, 11-15 and 18 were provisionally rejected on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over copending Application No. 10/287,491 in view of Wong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,985).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9-11 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,703,411) in view of Kato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,856,711), Wagner (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,148), Wong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,985), and Moss (U.S. Patent No. 6,311,637). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, Moss and further in view of Copeland (U.S. Patent No. 4,864,154) in view

of Copeland. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, and Moss in view of Maynard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,182). Claims 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, and Moss in view of Sumida (U.S. Patent No. 4,122,357). Claim 16 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, Moss, and Sumida in view of Copeland. Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, Moss, and Sumida in view of Maynard et al. Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, and Moss in view of Gieffers (U.S. Patent No. 5,296,840). Claim 19 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, Moss and Gieffers in view of Copeland et al. Claim 20 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bella, Kato, Wagner, Wong, Moss and Gieffers in view of Maynard et al.

Applicant has made extensive revisions to the specification to more particularly describe the subject matter in question and to correct the informalities specifically noted of record by the Examiner. Also, the specification has been amended to conform the written description to the drawings. In addition, Claims 1, 2, 9 and 11 have been amended in compliance with the Examiner's suggestions as set forth in the last paragraph on page 4 of the recent Office Action.

*Application No.: 10/662,356  
Art Unit: 2836*

*Attorney Docket No. 6935.15  
Confirmation No. 2061*

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10 as being indefinite, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 10 to delete the "whereby" clause in question. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims appearing in the application are in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Submitted herewith are two (2) Terminal Disclaimers in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321 and the appropriate filing fees under 37 CFR 1.20(d). These document should serve to obviate the Examiner's rejection of the instant claims on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting.


Applicant notes that Claims 3, 4 and 12-15 were not rejected based on prior art. The cancellation of Claims 18-20 by the present amendment renders the prior art rejections of record moot with respect to these particular claims. With regard to the remaining claims, Applicant has amended independent Claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 3. Independent Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 12, and Claims 14 and 15 have been rewritten in independent form. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 9, 14 and 15, as amended, and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the prior art of record.

Application No.: 10/662,356  
Art Unit: 2836

Attorney Docket No. 6935.15  
Confirmation No. 2061

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If such is not the case, the Examiner is requested to kindly contact the undersigned in an effort to satisfactorily conclude the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Dolph H. Torrence  
Registration No. 34,501  
(703) 486-1000

RCL:dht/rja

Attachments: Terminal Disclaimers (2)  
Checks (2) each in the Amount of \$65.00  
Replacement Sheets (3)  
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes (3)  
Check for \$100.00

## ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES






Fig. 2A

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES



## ANNOTATED SHEET SHOWING CHANGES



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Fig. 4